
Appendix A

Analysis of Scoping Comments

NFSR 5216-E and 5216-E1 Road Use Permit

Three letters specific to the project were received during the scoping period of May 27, 2016 to June 27, 2016. The three letters were analyzed and an analysis code assigned to the comments (see Table 1).

Comment Analysis Codes

- 1: Outside the scope of the proposed action.
- 2: Already decided by law, regulation, Forest Plan, or other higher level of decision.
- 3: Irrelevant to the decision to be made.
- 4: Conjectural and not supported by scientific evidence.
- 5: General comment, suggestion, opinion, or position statement.
- 6: Other agency or partner's consultation, review, advice, recommendation(s), etc.
- 7: Already considered in the proposed action or is standard procedure.
- 8: Will be included in an analysis of effects to the environment.

Codes 1 – 6 are standard codes. Comments assigned to these codes are considered to be non-significant issues. Code 7 was added as a category for those suggestions that are already proposed or for procedures that are routinely done. Code 8 was added as a category for suggestions that will be analyzed for effects to the environment.

Table 1: Comment Analysis

Commenter	Comment	Disposition
Gary Mcfarlane Friends of the Clearwater	Opening the roads up to logging vehicles would defeat the purpose of the closure for soil and water protection.	After further discussions with IDL, it was ascertained that IDL will not be conducting the timber harvest or related activities as originally presented in the May 27 2016 scoping letter. The corrected proposal is – <i>IDL is requesting the use of FSR 5216-E (0.1 miles) and 5216-E1 (0.2 miles) to access State land located at the end of the 5216-E1 for administrative purposes.</i> All of the other activities, i.e. issuance of a 5-year permit, road maintenance, design criteria, etc., would remain as specified in the scoping letter.
	The FS needs to analyze the impact of opening roads that have been closed on the water and soil resource.	Effects of issuing the permit on soil and water resources will be analyzed.

Commenter	Comment	Disposition
Gary Mcfarlane Friends of the Clearwater	The FS needs to consider the cumulative impacts from this proposal with adjacent national forest proposals like French Larch, Lower Orogrande and possibly the salvage sales in and around upper Lolo Creek.	Cumulative effects of issuing the road use permit will be analyzed.
	A CE seems inappropriate.	We have determined no extra-ordinary circumstances exist (36 CFR 220.6), and therefore the use of a CE is appropriate for each project.
Jonathan Oppenheimer and Mackenzie Case, Idaho Conservation League	We are concerned that the ... road use permits warrant additional information in the interest of soliciting meaningful input. As a result, we encourage you to provide a supplemental comment period on each of these projects to involve the public to the extent practicable.	5
	... activities approved via special use permits should be considered connected actions pursuant to NEPA.	There would be no activities associated with issuance of the permit other than proposed use and maintenance of the two roads by IDL. After further discussions with IDL, it was ascertained that IDL will not be conducting the timber harvest or related activities as originally presented in the May 27, 2016 scoping letter. The corrected proposal is – <i>IDL is requesting the use of FSR 5216-E (0.1 miles) and 5216-E1 (0.2 miles) to access State land located at the end of the 5216-E1 for administrative purposes.</i> All of the other activities, i.e. issuance of a 5-year permit, road maintenance, design criteria, etc., would remain as specified in the scoping letter.
	As such, the impacts associated with activities on lands administered by the Idaho Department of Lands and other entities (including but not limited to logging, road construction, application of pesticides, herbicides, and other activities) must be disclosed and analyzed prior to approval of the Road Use Permit by the Forest Service	See Response above.
	Impacts to these resources could warrant development of an EA or an EIS, however it is impossible to know based on the lack of information provided in the scoping notice.	We have determined no extra-ordinary circumstances exist (36 CFR 220.6), and therefore the use of a CE is appropriate for each project.
	Analyses should consider how the project is consistent with various management directions, including but not limited to the Endangered Species Act, Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forest Plans, Clean Water Act and any other relevant laws and agency direction.	7

Commenter	Comment	Disposition
Daniel Stewart Idaho Dept. of Env. Quality	Project activities may affect the NP-CW NF's ability to achieve flow based on pollutant allocation reduction associated with Forest land or management activities.	Effects to water resources from the proposed issuance of the road use permit will be analyzed.
	Projects initiated after the establishment of TMDL pollutant load allocations can adversely affect water quality through a reduction in load capacity.	